

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

USDC SDNY  
DOCUMENT  
ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
DOC #:  
DATE FILED: 3/4/2025

JOHN ADRIAN TORRES,

Plaintiff,

-V-

UNIVERSAL MUSIC GROUP N.V. and UNIVERSAL  
CITY STUDIOS LLC,

Defendants.

24-cv-5323 (LJL)

ORDER

LEWIS J. LIMAN, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff moves for reconsideration of the Court’s February 27, 2025 order at Dkt. No. 69. Dkt. No. 72. The motion is granted in part, the Court’s order at Dkt. No. 71 is rendered moot, and the February 27, 2025 order is modified as follows.

The Court has before it the following fully submitted motions: (1) Defendants Universal Music Group N.V. and Universal City Studios LLC motion to dismiss at Dkt. No. 50, to which Plaintiff responded on October 2, 2024, Dkt. No. 56, in connection with which Defendants filed a reply memorandum of law on October 11, 2024, Dkt. No. 57, and in further connection with which Plaintiff filed a response on October 14, 2024, Dkt. No. 59; and (2) Plaintiff's motion pursuant to Rule 56(d), Dkt. No. 60, to which Defendants responded on January 7, 2025, Dkt. No. 61, and in connection with which Plaintiff filed a reply memorandum on January 7, 2025, Dkt. No. 62. At the time of the February 27, 2025 order, the Court did not appreciate that Plaintiff's Rule 56(d) motion was fully submitted. The Court intends to consider those motions which are fully submitted. The February 27, 2025 order at Dkt. No. 69 is modified to reflect that, in addition to the pending motion to dismiss, the Court will also consider Plaintiff's Rule 56(d) motion. To the extent that the Court's February 27, 2025 order stated that it would not consider documents at any of the foregoing docket numbers, it is accordingly modified.

In addition, Plaintiff has filed the following documents which are out of time and for which he did not seek leave: (1) a supplemental memorandum of law in support of Plaintiff's


request for discovery and to supplement the record with new evidence, Dkt. No. 63; and (2) Plaintiff's notice of supplemental evidence relevant to his emergency motion for sanctions, Dkt. No. 68. Consistent with the February 27, 2025 order, the Court will not consider those documents.

Finally, the Court has denied Plaintiff's emergency motion to sanction defendants for violating Rules 3.6, 1.6, 1.9, and 8.4 of the New York Rules of Professional Conduct and to bar further extrajudicial statements prejudicing the case at Dkt. No. 64. Reconsideration of that denial is likewise denied.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully requested to close Dkt. No. 72, and re-open Dkt. No. 60.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 4, 2025  
New York, New York

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LEWIS J. LIMAN  
United States District Judge